



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/050,274

01/16/2002

Yoon Seok Yang

2080-3-66

7037

35884

7590

06/09/2008

LEE, HONG, DEGERMAN, KANG & SCHMADEKA
660 S. FIGUEROA STREET
Suite 2300
LOS ANGELES, CA 90017

EXAMINER

BROWN, CHRISTOPHER J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2134

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/09/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/050,274	Applicant(s) YANG, YOON SEOK	
	Examiner CHRISTOPHER J. BROWN	Art Unit 2134	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 March 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-7, 9-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 8 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

The Request for Continued Examination has been entered and accepted.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, filed 3/24/2008, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-24, under USC 103 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Vanstone US 6,212,281.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

The claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1, 10, and 22 are rejected under USC 101. Claims 1, 10, and 22 could be interpreted as pure software.

Software is not statutory subject matter. In order to overcome this 101 rejection the claims must incorporate a storage medium, a processor, or some sort of functional hardware that is supported by the instant specification such as the stated logic gates that make up the units as stated in the specification in paragraph [0049].

Claims 25-27 all claim a signal "start key signal", "data key valid" signal. Propagating signals are not patentable subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 1, 10, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The applicant states that the key schedule unit provides "the key schedule" to the block round unit, without storing expanded keys being generated by the key schedule unit.

The examiner has read paragraphs 0047, 0061 and figure 2. The specification does not state that the key schedule unit provides "the key schedule" do the block round unit, but only the round key (or key schedule output). The specification is silent with respect to storing expanded keys. The examiner asserts that the keys must be stored at some point in the system in order to use them. Claims 7, and 8 are directed towards key storage.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 5-7, 9-11, and 14-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wasilewski US 5,420,866 in view of Daemen (“AES Proposal: Rijndael,” March 1999),

As per claims 1, 10, and 22, Wasilewski teaches a control unit receiving a data stream of byte units where the data stream is an MPEG data stream (encoder) (Col 8 lines 52-60, Col 9 lines 58). Wasilewski does not explicitly teach converting data into block data for encryption. Wasilewski teaches encrypting the data with the DES protocol (Col 9 lines 8-12),

Daemen teaches encrypting the data with the AES protocol using blocks (page 8, “4 specification”) Thus the MPEG stream must be converted into blocks to be encrypted. Wasilewski teaches outputting encrypted stream data, thus the blocks are converted from blocks back into bytes (Col 9 lines 30-36). Daemen teaches that the key may be of variable size 128, 192, or 256 bits (page 8 “4 specification”). Daemen teaches a key schedule unit carrying out a key schedule for every round. Daemen teaches encrypting and decrypting data blocks.

It would be obvious one of ordinary skill in the art to use the apparatus of Wasilewski with the protocol of Daemen to provide an encryption scheme that is efficient for use with low-end microprocessors.

As per claim 2, Wasilewski teaches a control unit receiving a data stream of byte units where the data stream is an MPEG data stream (encoder) (Col 8 lines 52-60, Col 9 lines

58). Wasilewski does not explicitly teach converting data into block data for encryption. Wasilewski teaches encrypting the data with the DES protocol (Col 9 lines 8-12), Daemen teaches that AES may use a predetermined block size of 128 bits, 192 or 256 bits. Thus Wasilewski teaches that the MPEG stream must be converted into blocks to be encrypted. Wasilewski teaches outputting encrypted stream data, thus the blocks are converted from blocks back into bytes (Col 9 lines 30-36).

As per claim 14, 9, 21 Wasilewski teaches encrypting the data with the DES protocol. (Col 9 lines 8-12). Daemen teaches the key schedule may generate the key required for the block round in each round (page 17 5.1, key is updated between rounds).

As per claims 11, and 23 Wasilewski teaches the first format is a byte unit (MPEG stream (Col 9 lines 8-15). Daemen teaches a second format is a block unit (AES block), (page 8, Specification).

As per claims 5-7, and 15-20, and 24 Wasilewski does not specify the inputted key value and size. Daemen teaches a key size of 128 bits (page 14 4.3) and an expansion algorithm for the Rijndael block cipher wherein the key expansion unit expands the inputted key value into a size amounting to $\{\text{block size} * (\text{count of rounds} + 1)\}$ (page 14, section 4.3.1) for the purpose of proposing a new encryption standard that is, among other things, efficient for use with 8-bit microprocessors (page 28, section 7.5). Daemen further teach that the key register has a capacity amounting to $\{(\text{size of an inputted block})$

* (size of one round)} (Daemen, section 4.3.2). It is inherent that the key is stored in a key register.

Claims 3, 12, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wasilewski US 5,420,866 in view of Daemen ("AES Proposal: Rijndael," March 1999) in view of Mroczkowski ("Implementation of the block cipher Rijndael using Altera FPGA," May 2000)

As per claim 12, Wasilewski teaches a control unit receiving a data stream of byte units where the data stream is an MPEG data stream (encoder) (Col 8 lines 52-60, Col 9 lines 58). Wasilewski does not explicitly teach converting data into block data for encryption. Wasilewski teaches encrypting the data with the DES protocol (Col 9 lines 8-12), Daemen teaches using a predetermined block size of 128bits (page 8 "Specification). Thus Wasilewski teaches that the MPEG stream must be converted into 128 bit blocks to be encrypted. Wasilewski teaches outputting encrypted stream data, thus the 128 bit blocks are converted from blocks back into bytes (Col 9 lines 30-36). Wasilewski does not teach buffers.

It would be obvious one of ordinary skill in the art to use the apparatus of Wasilewski with the protocol of Daemen to provide an encryption scheme that is efficient for use with low-end microprocessors.

Mroczkowski teaches data inputted from the control unit and then stores corresponding result in the output buffer of the control unit (Mroczkowski, section 2.1).

It would be obvious one of ordinary skill in the art to use the apparatus of Wasilewski with the protocol of Mroczkowski to provide an encryption scheme that is efficient for use with low-end microprocessors. .

As per claims 3, and 13 Wasilewski does not specify completing all round calculations and storing the result in a corresponding output buffer. Mroczkowski teaches implementing a block cipher wherein a block round unit (Mroczkowski, Figures 1 and 2) completes all round calculation of data having been currently encrypted or decrypted before a next block data (Mroczkowski, input data) inputted from the control unit and then stores corresponding result in the output buffer of the control unit (Mroczkowski, section 2.1).

It would be obvious one of ordinary skill in the art to use the apparatus of Wasilewski with the protocol of Mroczkowski to provide an encryption scheme that is efficient for use with low-end microprocessors.

Claims 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wasilewski US 5,420,866 in view of Daemen ("AES Proposal: Rijndael," March 1999), in view of Vanstone US 6,212,281.

As per claims 25-27, Wasilewski teaches a control unit receiving a data stream of byte units where the data stream is an MPEG data stream (encoder) (Col 8 lines 52-60, Col 9 lines 58). Daemen teaches using an input to generate a key according to schedule and

size (expansion) Daemen teaches a key size (page 14 4.3) and an expansion algorithm for the Rijndael block cipher wherein the key expansion unit expands the inputted key value (page 14, section 4.3.1). It is inherent that the cryptographic process happens in real time when it is initiated by key expansion input.

It would be obvious one of ordinary skill in the art to use the apparatus of Wasilewski with the protocol of Daemen to provide an encryption scheme that is efficient for use with low-end microprocessors.

The Wasilewski-Daemen combination does not teach key validation. Vanstone teaches a digital signature protocol which enables the user to validate a file. (Column 3 lines 50-60, Column 4 lines 30-40). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the digital signatures and hashing of Vanstone because they are well known in the art to assure a file is valid and has not been tampered with.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 8 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHRISTOPHER J. BROWN whose telephone number is (571)272-3833. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kambiz Zand can be reached on (571)272-3811. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Christopher J Brown/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2134

6/8/08